

b) the informal drawings were sufficient for examination, and
c) any available documentation that supports the background prior art comments is requested.

Applicant has reviewed the office action and amended the specification and the drawings without adding any new matter. The amendments to the drawings and to the specification were done to note the relationship between the specification and the FIG. 2 and to add reference numerals to each as appropriate. Applicant has reviewed applicant's files and not found any documentation supporting the background comments. These comments were evidently based on the inventor's knowledge at the time the application was filed. In view of the comments below applicant respectfully requests that the examiner reconsider the pending claims and withdraw the above noted rejections under 103 (a).

The examiner maintains that Kane is an analogous electronic mail message delivery system and discloses operating to provide a server 102 with message inputs to receive email formatted messages and provide delivery to a remote selective call transceiver 134 which can originate a reply request via a communication terminal function (referring to the Abstract, Fig.1, col. 1 ln 17- col. 5 ln 23). From this, in the examiner's view, Kane discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention except for parsing retrieved information in a format configured for the receiver and directing the retrieved information to a second communication device.

Next the examiner relies on Morgan et al. for showing that it was known to provide the capability of redirecting a message to another communication device 102, 104-109 through the server 101 of a wireless communication device 112, referring to the Abstract, Fig 1-3, col. 2 ln. 29 - col. 3 ln 68. Lastly the examiner combines Meske, Jr. et al. alleging it shows that it was known to parse 400-430 information 410 at a message server 150 after retrieving 250, 220 it at the request of a user agent for presentation in a desired format at the user's particular station 100, referring to the Abstract, Fig. 4-5, col. 2 ln 22 - col. 3 ln 8, and col. 5 ln 17 - col. 6 ln

36. From this the examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to provide Kane's message delivery system with the message redirection function of Morgan et al. and the message parsing/reformatting function of Meske et al. thereby resulting or showing the system and methods of claims 1-17.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Kane reference discusses a system by which E-mail may be delivered from any of a number of sources or originating devices to a selective calling unit. The system includes the ability to alias an address to a pager pin# and the selective calling device is equipped with a modem for replying or initiating E-mail when the device is coupled to a telephone line (Abstract, Fig.1, col. 1 ln 17- col. 5 ln 23). Morgan discusses sending a message or document to a recipient by way of a server, appropriately translated for that recipient, and allowing that recipient to forward the message to another destination or reply to the message with additional comments or annotations in which case only the new information or annotation is transmitted (Abstract, Fig 1-3, col. 2 ln. 29 - col. 8 ln 34). Meske Jr. et al. discusses, generally, information retrieval, utilizing a server resident script based approach (col. 4 ln 40 - 60), and the subsequent processing of retrieved information to facilitate efficient utilization of the information by a user (Abstract, Fig. 4-5, col. 2 ln 22 - col. 3 ln 8, and col. 5 ln 17 - col. 6 ln 36 and the balance of the disclosure).

Applicant's claim 1 defines a method for coupling a selective call transceiver to a widely distributed information source. This method recites the steps of: 1) operatively coupling a server to the widely distributed information source, wherein the server contains agents for retrieving information customized for a given selective call transceiver; 2) originating a request for information at the selective call transceiver to the server via a communication terminal operatively coupled to the server; and 3) retrieving the information from the widely distributed information source using the agents in the server. Applicant respectfully submits that the three references in combination or singularly do not show 1) operatively coupling a server to the widely distributed information source, wherein the server contains agents for retrieving information customized for a given selective call transceiver; 2) originating a request for

information at the selective call transceiver to the server via a communication terminal operatively coupled to the server; as required by claim 1.

More specifically none of the references in any combination speak or suggest agents (Meske Jr. et al is limited to a fixed scrip that is user configurable) for retrieving information customized for a given selective call transceiver. Further the references, regardless of combination, do not show or suggest originating a request for information at the selective call transceiver to the server via a communication terminal operatively coupled to the server. Kane and Morgan et al. discuss one device (terminal) sending an E-mail or document or modifications to a document to another device (selective call transceiver) but do not show one device requesting information for another. For these reasons applicant respectfully submits that Kane, Morgan et al., or Meske Jr. et al. or any combination of the three do not show all of the limitations recited by claim 1 and thus do not properly support an obviousness rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 2 - 6 are dependent upon claim 1, hence include the limitations of claim 1 and thus are subject to the above reasoning as well.

Claim 7 recites a method for coupling a selective call transceiver to a widely distributed information source. The method includes the steps of; 1) dynamically changing protocol entities in a synchronized manner within the selective call transceiver; 2) receiving the entities at a dedicated server that distributes agents on the selective call transceiver's behalf to find information on the widely distributed information source; and 3) modifying a protocol between the dedicated server and the agent to optimize the cost of communication over the air. Again these references in any combination fail to show or suggest either step 1) or step 2) or arguably step 3). While one or more of the references suggest modifying a protocol to match the ability of a communicating device nothing is discussed or suggested concerning dynamically changing protocol entities in a synchronized manner within the selective call transceiver or receiving such entities at a server that, from above, distributes agents etc. For these reasons applicant respectfully submits that Kane, Morgan et al., or Meske Jr. et al. or any combination of the three do not show all of the limitations recited by claim 7 and thus do not properly support an obviousness rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claim 8 defines a communication system for coupling a selective call transceiver to a widely distributed information source. The system includes, among other elements, a server coupled to the widely distributed information source, wherein the server contains agents for retrieving predetermined information customized for a given selective call transceiver. Therefore applicant respectfully submits these references do not show or suggest this claim for the reasons noted above with referring to claim 1. Claim 9 and 10 in varying scope are limited by the distribution of agents etc. as well as dynamically changing protocol entities etc. For these reasons applicant respectfully submits that Kane, Morgan et al., or Meske Jr. et al. or any combination of the three do not show all of the limitations recited by claim 8 - 10 and thus do not properly support an obviousness rejection of claim 8 - 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claim 11 and claim 15 (in analogous method form) defines a server for retrieving user selected information from a widely distributed information source using a selective call transceiver in a communication system for requesting information wirelessly from the server. The server includes: 1) a memory location for mapping user selectable inputs from the selective call transceiver and inputs from the communication system with tokens; 2) a translator for translating the tokens at the server into retrieval commands for retrieving information from the widely distributed information source; and 3) a formatter for formatting the retrieved information in a format suitable for reception at a device selected by a user of the selective call transceiver. Nothing in the Kane, Morgan et al., or Meske Jr. et al. or any combination thereof shows or suggests the use of tokens much less the use of tokens as defined by claim 11 or 15. For these reasons applicant respectfully submits that Kane, Morgan et al., or Meske Jr. et al. or any combination of the three do not show all of the limitations recited by claim 11 or 15 and thus do not properly support an obviousness rejection of these claim under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 12 - 14 and 16 -17 are, respectively, dependent upon claim 11 or 15, hence include the limitations of claim 11 or 15 and thus are subject to the above reasoning as well.

In summary applicant respectfully submits that Kane, Morgan et al., or Meske Jr. et al. or any combination thereof do not show all limitations of any of claims 1 - 17.

therefore these references do not properly support the above noted rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the examiner reconsider and withdraw such rejections.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that the claims, as amended, clearly and patentably distinguish over the cited reference of record and as such are to be deemed allowable. Such allowance is hereby earnestly and respectfully solicited at an early date. Any questions, suggestions, or comments are welcomed at the number below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required to Deposit Account No. 50-0280.

Respectfully submitted,
Cannon et al.

Please send correspondence to:

MOTOROLA, INC.
IP Dept./MS E230
5401 N. Beach Street
Fort Worth, TX 76137

By

Charles W. Bethards
Charles W. Bethards
Attorney / Agent of Record
Registration No. 36,453
MOTOROLA, INC.
Phone: (817) 245-4604
Fax: (817) 245-2137